

{In Archive} Kansas PWSS program report - DRWM and WENF

Neftali Hernandez-Santiago to: Monique Carter

08/30/2007 02:30 PM

Archive:

Cc: Mary Mindrup, Diane Huffman, Rochelle Gibson, Monica Wurtz

This message is being viewed in an archive.

Monique,

Could you please finalize this cover letter and report?





Cover letter KDHE APE May 2007.doc KS APE May 2007.doc

Thank you,

Neftali Hernandez-Santiago, US Environmental Protection Agency Water, Wetlands, & Pesticides Division Drinking Water Management Branch 901 N. 5th Street Kansas City, KS 66101 Office (913) 551 - 7036 Fax (913) 551 - 9036 The Birth Mark Markett - transmit majoriting (10 february and 1 fe

the state of the s

US Environmental Protection Agency Region 7

Kansas Department of Health and Environment
Drinking Water Program
Annual Performance Evaluation

Draft Report

May 7-11, 2007 On-Sitè Visit

Table of Contents

Introduction Summary of Findings

Part I - PWSS Program Review

- A) Staffing
- B) Funding
- C) Primacy
- D) Workplan Status
- E) PWS Inventory
- F) Stage 1 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule
- G) Long Term 1 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule
- H) Lead and Copper
- I) Total Coliform Rule
- J) Sanitary Survey
- K) Nitrates
- L) Operator Certification
- M) Capacity Development
- N) Radionuclides
- O) Arsenic
- P) Public Notification Rule
- Q) CCR, Nitrate monitoring, Phase II/V

Part II - Drinking Water Enforcement Review

- A) Nitrates
- B) Stage 1 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule
- C) Long Term 1 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule
- D) Radionuclides
- E) Total Coliform Rule
- F) Public Notification
- G Enforcement Follow-up
- H) Enforcement Recommendations

Appendixes

- 1) PWSS Program File Review Detail
- 2) Enforcement File Review Detail

Introduction

An announcement of the Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) was mailed to the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) on April 20, 2007. As outlined in that letter, the on-site evaluation of the Kansas drinking water program was conducted on May 7-11, 2007 at the KDHE offices in Topeka, Kansas.

Neftali Hernandez-Santiago with the Drinking Water Management Branch and Rochelle Gibson with the Water Enforcement Branch conducted the evaluation for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Dave Waldo, Darrell Plummer and their staff from KDHE, participated in or assisted EPA in conducting the evaluation.

The exit conference was held at 1:00 p.m. on May 11, 2007, at the KDHE's office. Dave Waldo and Darrel Plummer from KDHE, and Mary T. Mindrup, Rochelle Gibson, and Neftali Hernandez-Santiago from EPA were present at the exit conference.

Summary of Findings

In general, the review indicated that KDHE maintains good documentation in the files, including such items as emails and memos about meetings or discussions with water systems, and has performed well implementing the rules, maintaining the data base, notifying systems of violations and tracking compliance status. Additionally, KDHE performs proactive activities such as sending monitoring reminder letters, which helps water systems avoid monitoring violations.

Below is a list of the highlights/issues of this draft report:

- 1. The EPA acknowledges that KDHE will be requesting an extension of primacy for the new drinking water regulations; however, EPA will need additional assistance to implement the new rules on small communities in Kansas.
- 2. Although the State has shown progress addressing violations of the Stage 1 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (Stage 1 DBPR), and the Long Term 1 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT1), EPA would like to see all systems returned to compliance in a timely manner.
- 3. One of the concerns on your sanitary survey program is that the severity of findings assigned during a sanitary survey seems to be determined by the judgment of the inspector and does not always follow the Sanitary Survey Site Observations submitted by Kansas in your primacy application. We advised KDHE to use the approved protocol.
- 4. The EPA recommends that the type and timeframe for public notice be monitored more closely to ensure that it complies with the Public Notification Rule and that written procedures be put into place.
- 5. The EPA recommends that the Operator Certification Program include information on any review (partial or total) conducted of the program and that

- any recommendations made to improve the program be placed in the annual report. At this point, EPA believes that the internal/external reviews of the operator certification program are adequate.
- 6. The EPA recommends evaluating the impact of new rules on the operator certification program in order to evaluate training needs for operators.
- 7. The EPA asks KDHE to provide technical assistance to water systems looking for solutions to radionuclides and arsenic MCL issues, and take timely and appropriate enforcement if systems become a significant non-complier.
- 8. Due to a reorganization of the KDHE laboratory and in order to balance the work load of the lead and copper analysis, some systems in Kansas will be conducting lead and copper analysis past the triennial reduced monitoring period allowed under the rule. This means that some systems will be collecting samples one, two, or three years after they are required. The EPA recommends that for any future reorganization of the scheduling of samples, interim measures are put in place to avoid any system sampling past the monitoring timeframes allowed by the rules.
- 9. The EPA recommends that KDHE update its Enforcement Policy and develop escalation policies for groups of contaminants to identify actions and timeframes that would be taken based on types of and number of violations.
- 10. The KDHE does have an Enforcement Escalation Policy for Microbiological Violations. The EPA recommends that KDHE follow their Escalation Policy for Microbiological Violations and take timely and appropriate enforcement if systems become a significant non-complier.
- 11. EPA needs additional information on how the TCR results are handled including the need to schedule repeat samples, monitoring violations, MCL violations and enforcement actions.
- 12. The EPA recommends KDHE provide assistance to systems in finding solutions to their radionuclide and arsenic issues, and enforcement, if the systems become significant non-compliers.
- 13. The EPA recommends that KDHE review how nitrate MCL compliance is calculated. Additionally, it would be beneficial to develop an escalation policy, or other written procedures, for addressing systems with a history of nitrate reoccurrences.
- 14. It may be advantageous for Kansas water systems to develop and implement a wellhead protection program, if they have not already done so. A wellhead protection program may help deter elevated nitrate levels thus allowing water systems to remain in compliance with the nitrate MCL. A wellhead protection

program may not be effective in returning a system to compliance after the nitrate MCL has been exceeded.

Part I – PWSS Program Review

A) Staffing

David Waldo provided an updated organizational chart for the central office. The KDHE drinking water program has approximately 19.5 full time employees (FTEs). The program has a vacant position for an engineer and is currently advertising the position. The district offices have 9 to 10 FTEs each. These personnel are in charge of the field activities such as the sanitary surveys.

The KDHE is evaluating succession planning for employees who are eligible to retire shortly, and would like to double encumber the positions to transfer knowledge and provide training to new hires.

The KDHE believes current staff can manage the work load of existing rules (through arsenic), but will re-evaluate work load of new drinking water regulations such as the Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (Stage 2 DBPR), the Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2), and later rules once they are adopted.

The EPA believes that KDHE staff is doing a very good job keeping abreast of rules and are aware of issues at the system level.

B) Funding

The federal money for the drinking water program has been steady during the last couple of years. Due to inflation, federal allocations are paying for two less FTEs compared to previous years.

The KDHE expressed some concern about the money expended to maintain the database. Approximately \$200,000 was expended in 2006 on an update to the system and the estimated cost of maintenance will be about \$100,000 a year. They also mentioned that the system will have to be updated once more in order to incorporate new regulations. Because of the above considerations, KDHE will be using State Revolving Fund money to cover the maintenance cost for the system.

C) Primacy

KDHE is planning to request a one year extension for the LT2 and Stage 2 DBPR rules. These extension requests are due on January 4, 2008. KDHE is planning to submit a primacy application for LT2, Stage 2, and the Ground Water Rule (GWR) by November 8, 2008.

The EPA requested additional assistance to implement the new rules on small communities. Currently, KDHE is providing information to small systems by checking their water monitoring results and advising of any waiver or certification for which they may qualify.

D) Workplan

KDHE is on target to meet most, if not all, of the commitments stipulated in the work plan.

E) PWS Inventory

The populations of drinking water systems are updated every year using the Secretary of State's Annual Report. If a system requests a change on population served, KDHE requires a certification from the system before any change is made in the Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS). Also, KDHE has other tools to update the number of connections and administrative contacts, etc. The KDHE is maintaining and updating the inventory as required.

F) Stage 1 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (Stage 1 DBPR)

Kansas had 43 systems with Stage 1 DBPR maximum contaminant level (MCL) violations at the beginning of 2006. As of December 2007, 33 systems were in violation. All 30 systems, except Burlington, (which has built a new treatment plant), have some type of enforcement action in place. In addition, at the beginning of 2006, Kansas had 39 systems with treatment technique violations for Total Organic Carbon (TOC) removal, and 24 systems by the end of 2006. Although the KDHE has progressed addressing Stage 1 DBPR violations, EPA would like to see all systems returned to compliance in a timely manner.

Chlorine residuals are reported from the laboratory to the Topeka office in an electronic format. The KDHE then uses this information to determine compliance.

G) Long Term 1 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT1)

At the time of the review, Kansas had three systems with LT1 violations for lack of turbidity meters. These systems are under an administrative order from KDHE. This issue was identified by a previous evaluation and EPA would like to see these systems achieve compliance.

Under the LT1, KDHE reviews the compliance reports for the surface water systems and makes the compliance determinations. Based on the information reviewed, it seems that the systems are achieving the turbidity and CT requirements.

Under the LT1 implementation, EPA recommends developing written procedures on how to process the reports submitted by the systems.

H) Lead and Copper Rule

In 2006, KDHE had 276 systems required to monitor, and 17 had monitoring violations (these systems are rescheduled to sample in 2007). From the systems that completed the monitoring, 14 systems exceeded the action level (AL) (two systems for lead and 12 systems for copper). The City of Wichita was one of the systems that exceeded the lead action level and it is conducting the required public education.

Kansas has 76 systems in some level of corrosion control since the rule was promulgated. Eight of those systems have not achieved optimal corrosion control for copper.

Due to a reorganization of the KDHE laboratory and in order to balance the work load of the lead and copper analysis, some systems in Kansas will be conducting lead and copper analysis past the triennial reduced monitoring period allowed under the rule. This means that some systems will be collecting samples one, two, or three years after they are required. The EPA recommends that for any future reorganization of the scheduling of samples, interim measures are put in place to avoid any system sampling past the monitoring timeframes allowed by the rules.

I) Total Coliform Rule (TCR)

Unfortunately, EPA could not conduct the review for TCR due to weather conditions that prevented some KDHE personnel's presence at work.

Please provide an explanation of how the TCR results are handled including the need to schedule repeat samples, monitoring violations, MCL violations and enforcement actions.

J) Sanitary Surveys (SS)

The KDHE tracks the frequency of SSs using SDWIS. The KDHE uses the dates of the previous sanitary surveys to generate a list of systems that need a SS. The list is sent to the field offices so they can coordinate the site visits. The tracking system is working very well.

Since the SS dates are reported in SDWIS, KDHE is already complying with a new reporting requirement, which will be effective on December 31, 2007. The EPA did not find any deficiencies for sanitary surveys. However, EPA recommends reporting in SDWIS any significant deficiencies discovered during a SS.

The EPA reviewed 8 SS reports. A concern is that the severity of findings seems to be determined by the judgment of the inspector and does not always follow the SS Site Observations submitted by KDHE in the primacy application. For example, some items considered significant deficiencies in the SS Site Observations were considered recommendations. The problem is the lack of enforceability for correction of recommended items that were indeed significant deficiencies. The EPA recommends following the SS Site Observations as approved. If the document changes, it must be resubmitted to EPA for approval.

K) Nitrates

Kansas has 15 systems with nitrates violations, of which four are under a Nitrate Strategy consent order.

Of the files reviewed, the monitoring results were in the file and the frequencies of samples were correct.

The EPA recommends that Kansas water systems develop and implement a wellhead protection program, if they have not already done so. A wellhead protection program may help deter elevated nitrate levels thus allowing water systems to remain in compliance with the nitrate MCL.

L) Operator Certification

The operator certification program has been working well with personnel adequately managing the work load. The program is currently working with a contractor to conduct a job analysis for the drinking water operators. Based on the job analysis results, adjustments will be made to the program. The program is also working to review the exam questions for the operator exam. The program is also creating a CD similar to the Operator Basis CD from EPA, but customized for Kansas.

One of the most significant changes to the program will be a change on the classification of ground water systems. The plan is to decrease the number of categories from four to two. The reason is that many of the level III and IV groundwater system operators are receiving training in areas that are applicable only to surface water systems.

The program is concerned about the interpretation of the internal/external review requirements under the Operator Certification Guidelines. They believe that the requirements are unique for the operator certification program and not to the drinking water program as a whole. The EPA believes that the Kansas operator certification program is complying with the review requirements, but future guidance from EPA Headquarters (HQ) will help clarify what constitutes an internal/external review of the program.

The EPA would like the program to report recommendations from reviews conducted within the annual report. The EPA also recommends evaluating the impact of new rules in order to evaluate training needs for operators.

M) Capacity Development

The capacity development program has been focused on the implementation of KanCap or the board member training and is working to start with the implementation of the Rate Check-up/CapFinance programs to assist small systems in revising their rates and to create budgets plans and strategies for their system.

N) Radionuclides

The KDHE is expecting to have more radionuclides MCL violations than what was originally anticipated (approximately 20). Initial monitoring ends on December 31, 2007. Currently, Kansas had approximately nine systems exceeding the MCL for one or more radionuclides.

The EPA recommends KDHE provide assistance to these systems in finding solutions to their radionuclide issues, and enforcement, if the systems become significant non-compliers.

O) Arsenic

Initial monitoring ends on December 31, 2007 for ground water systems. Kansas has approximately 20 systems that are exceeding the arsenic MCL. The EPA recommends KDHE provide assistance to these systems in finding solutions to their arsenic issues, and enforcement, if the systems become significant non-compliers.

P) Public Notification Rule

Under the Public Notice Rule for Tier 1 and Tier 2 public notices, it was not clear how KDHE is measuring the time frames of notification. For instance, it was not clear when the clock started for the 24-hour or 30-day public notice requirement.

The EPA recommends written procedures that specify when the time frame starts in order to determine compliance with the time frames established by the rule.

Q) Consumer Confidence Report Rule (CCR), Nitrate monitoring and Phase II / V monitoring

The EPA believes the CCR, Nitrate monitoring and Phase II / V monitoring are implemented satisfactorily.

Part II - Drinking Water Enforcement Review

The Kansas Public Water Supply Program enforcement evaluation consisted of discussions with KDHE staff and a review of selected public water system files. The KDHE staff was very helpful and responsive to EPA staff in obtaining requested information during the review. The KDHE had not made any changes in 2006 of its enforcement practice. In 2006, as result of the 2005 enforcement review, EPA recommended that KDHE update its official enforcement policy and develop escalation policies. The KDHE has an escalation policy for microbiological contaminants but not for other contaminants. At the time of this review, KDHE had not updated its enforcement policy nor developed additional escalation policies. In 2006, KDHE issued 24 Directives (a non-formal enforcement action), 19 Consent Orders, one Administrative Order, and six Administrative Orders with Penalty.

In general, the review indicated that KDHE maintains good documentation in the files, including such items as emails and memos about meetings or discussions with water systems, and has performed well in notifying systems of violations and tracking compliance status. Additionally, KDHE performs proactive activities such as sending monitoring reminder letters helping water systems avoid monitoring violations. The coordination of individual compliance officer activities to determine the need for enforcement is done through weekly staff meetings and compliance officer interactions. The KDHE uses databases to the full extent and is able to generate reports assisting them in tracking violations and water system compliance status.

The enforcement file review consisted of a review of 15 public water systems selected to represent a range of violation types, water source, and population sizes. Of the public water systems selected, 13 were community water systems ranging in population of 87 - 2,707, and two were transient non-community water systems. Of the 13 community water systems, three purchase all water from another public water system, three have surface water sources, and seven have ground water sources. The two transient non-community water systems have ground water sources. The review covered small systems (those with a population of 3,300 or less) because SDWIS data indicates that most violations occur at small systems rather than medium or large sized systems.

Of the 13 community water systems, five were reviewed due to violations of the Stage 1 DBPR, two of these five also had violations of the LT1. Five public water systems were reviewed due to nitrate levels which exceeded the MCL, two public water systems had incurred violations for exceeding the MCL for a radionuclide, and one community water system had TCR violations. Both transient non-community water systems were selected due to TCR violations.

Redacted non responsive

Of the 15 files reviewed, the KDHE had taken a formal enforcement action with five of the water systems (, Pretty Prairie,).

A) Nitrates

Enforcement discussion primarily focused on nitrate issues. In March 1997, the KDHE entered into an agreement, titled Kansas Nitrate Strategy (Strategy), with EPA to establish an approach KDHE would take to address community public water systems which have violations of the nitrate MCL (10 mg/L). The terms of the Strategy were then agreed upon between KDHE and the water system through a Nitrate Consent Order, which expired seven years after signature. In 2005, EPA evaluated the implementation and effectiveness of the Strategy and subsequently told KDHE to discontinue its use. The KDHE was informed of EPA position in July 2006, and was requested to submit a plan to phase out the Strategy and transition to a method in which timely compliance would be obtained. The KDHE responded in February 2007 that four Nitrate Consent Orders remained in place, three expiring in 2010 and one expiring in 2011. The KDHE intends to honor the terms of those Orders until their expiration.

The KDHE proposed that community water systems incurring nitrate MCL violations in two out of three consecutive quarters will receive a Directive from KDHE requiring the system to prepare an engineering report identifying options and cost estimates for achieving compliance. The KDHE will then review the options and cost estimates and negotiate a schedule to complete the best option. Discussions during the review indicated that KDHE would not require the water systems to implement options unless the water system is consistently exceeding the nitrate MCL four consecutive quarters.

Information provided by KDHE indicates 17 water systems had entered into a Nitrate Consent Order between 1996 and 2004. Nitrate Consent Orders for four water systems remain in place, one Order has expired while the system has not achieved compliance (Pretty Prairie), and 12 Orders had been rescinded (indicating that the system had nitrate results less than the MCL in four consecutive quarters). Although the Nitrate Consent Order with Pretty Prairie expired in 2003, KDHE continued to enter the 1996 Order in SDWIS as an enforcement action taken to address those violations occurring after the 2003 expiration.

Based on information provided by KDHE during the review, 15 community water systems had nitrate MCL violations in 2006. Populations ranged from 65 to 1,984 people. Two of these systems are consecutive water systems. Of these 15 water systems, three systems (Argonia, Harper Co. RWD 4, and Pretty Prairie) had nitrate MCL violations in two consecutive quarters, one system (Arlington) had MCL violations in three consecutive quarters, and two systems (Green Acres Mobile Home Court, and Osborne Co. RWD 1A) had MCL violations in four consecutive quarters. All of these nitrate results were less than 20 mg/L. Nine of the 15 community water systems had MCL violations in 2005 (Argonia, Arlington, Brewster, Harper County RWD #4,

Norwich, Osborne County RWD #1A, Pretty Prairie, Rooks County RWD #1, and Woodston).

The situation with many of these water systems is that they experience nitrate MCL violations in one quarter, or two non-consecutive quarters in a year, and have nitrate results below the MCL level the remainder of the year. Systems may then experience the same conditions the next year. Of the files reviewed, two water systems (Kirwin, Pretty Prairie) had installed new wells in the past due to nitrate MCL violations, but then experienced MCL exceedances from the new wells.

One water system (Conway Springs) has a history of nitrate MCL violations from 1995 to 2004. Based on sample analysis results provided by KDHE staff, the system had taken four samples during the first and second quarters of 2005 and those results were averaged to determine compliance for each quarter. According to the Code of Federal Regulations Title 40 Part 141 Subpart C (141.23 (i)(3)) compliance shall be determined based on the average of the initial and confirmation samples. In this situation, KDHE should base compliance on the average of the initial and confirmation samples rather than averaging all the samples in the quarter. Based on the information provided, the water system should have received MCL violations for both the first and second quarters of 2005. The EPA recommends KDHE review how compliance is calculated.

A system is returned to compliance after two consecutive quarters below the MCL. After four consecutive quarters below the MCL, monitoring can be reduced to annually.

Because KDHE requires all public water systems to chlorinate, and chlorine converts nitrite to nitrate, KDHE does not require systems to sample for nitrites. The Phase II/V monitoring and waiver plan was approved by EPA on June 26, 1995.

The EPA recommends that Kansas water systems develop and implement a wellhead protection program, if they have not already done so. A wellhead protection program may help deter elevated nitrate levels thus allowing water systems to remain in compliance with the nitrate MCL. A wellhead protection program may not be effective in returning a system to compliance after the nitrate MCL has been exceeded.



F) Public Notification

The file review indicated that notification of a violation was generally issued by KDHE within 30 days from when each violation occurred. Additionally, KDHE sends information regarding the public notice requirements and certification of delivery of public notice form. The KDHE uses SDWIS to track when public notification was performed, and when the certification of delivery form was received. The KDHE staff indicted that a public notification compliance report is generated from SDWIS once per month to determine if public notice certificates of delivery are missing or late in being received. However, it was not clear when the timeframe for tracking public notice was to begin. If the public notification was not performed within the required timeframe, or the certificate of delivery was not received within the required timeframe, a public notice violation should be assessed.

The review of files for Pretty Prairie, indicates that public notification of acute nitrate violations may not be performed as required. Each of these water systems reported to conduct public notification by mail and by newspaper. The timeframe from the date of the notification of violation and the public notification ranged from three to nine days. Violation of the MCL for nitrate requires a Tier 1 public notification. This level of public notification requires that water systems provide public notice within 24 hours after the system learns of the violation and to use, at a minimum, one or more of the following forms of delivery: 1) Appropriate broadcast media; 2) Posting; 3) Hand delivery; or 4) Another method approved in writing by the primacy agency. Mailing is not an appropriate method of delivery for this type of public notice. The EPA recommends that the type and timeframe for public notice be monitored more closely to ensure that it complies with the applicable regulations, and a written protocol be put into place.

A review of the file for Lakeside United Methodist Center indicated that the water system incurred TCR monthly violations in October 2005, and April, May, June August and September 2006. Certificate of delivery of public notification for these violations was not located in the file. SDWIS data indicates public notification violations were assessed in October 2005 and April 2006, but not for May, June, August, and September 2006. The KDHE staff indicated that faulty violation end date fields were apparently populated by SDWIS/State database and closed any open public notification requirements. Additionally, incorrect violation type codes were initially used. SDWIS/State data shows that public notification violations were assessed, however this violations did not show up in the federal SDWIS system. Additionally, it appears that this water system has not conducted public notification for these TCR violations. Public notification of these violations is to be conducted within 30 days of discovery of the violation.





Appendix 1

PWSS Program File Review Detail





Pretty Prairie, KS2015501

The Pretty Prairie public water system serves a community of 600 people. The water system has historical nitrate violations from 1995 through 2006. Historically, the water system installed new wells in response to a 1994 Administrative Order issued by EPA. Once in operation, the new wells exceeded the nitrate MCL. The KDHE then issued a Nitrate Consent Order to the water system in October 1996. That Order expired in 2003. No other formal enforcement action has been taken to date. According to SDWIS data, the system was in violation of the nitrate MCL for three quarters in 2003, three quarters in 2004, two quarters in 2005, and two quarters in 2006. The last two quarters of 2006 the system incurred nitrate monitoring violations. Although the Order expired in 2003, KDHE continued to enter the 1996 Order in SDWIS as an enforcement action taken to address those violations occurring after the 2003 expiration.

Additionally, the water system took a quarterly nitrate sample in January 2006, but did not submit that sample result to KDHE until March 29, 2006. The result indicated an MCL exceedance. The KDHE notified the system of non-compliance in a letter dated March 30, 2006, and notified the system to issue public notification within 24 hours, and return the certificate of delivery by April 12, 2006. The public notice certificate of delivery dated April 14, 2006 and received at KDHE April 17, 2006, indicated notice was distributed by mail on April 5, 2006. The system incurred a public notice violation for the time period April 1 through April 5, 2006.

